



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,397	06/30/2000	Ahsan Syed Kabir	MS1-569US	9888
22801	7590	05/07/2004	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			ALI, SYED J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2127	9
DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/608,397

Applicant(s)

KABIR ET AL.

Examiner

Syed J Ali

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 44 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to Amendment A, paper number 8, which was filed February 27, 2004. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.
3. Applicant is advised that should claim 40 be found allowable, claim 42 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. Claims 41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations:

- a. Claim 41 recites the limitation 'The computer-readable medium' in line 1.
- b. Claim 43 recites the limitations 'The computer-readable medium', "the first user Internet concept", and "the second user Internet concept" in lines 1-2.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-11, 13-19, 21-23, 25, 27-35, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Courts et al. (USPN 6,085,220) (hereinafter Courts).

As per claim 1, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including a method, comprising:

receiving a request to switch from a current network context that corresponds to a first user identity to a new network context that corresponds to a second user identity (col. 8 lines 1-17); and

switching from the current network context to the new network context without process shutdown (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 2, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein process shutdown includes terminating a user session utilizing the current network context and logging into a user session utilizing the new network context (col. 8 lines 1-17).

Art Unit: 2127

As per claim 3, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the current network context includes web page data specific to a user, and wherein the web page data is stored in a memory location based on a hash of a universal resource locator [URL] for the web page (col. 1 lines 29-41; col. 6 lines 5-30).

As per claim 4, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein:

the current network context is associated with a current globally unique user identifier [guid] (col. 7 lines 6-23);

the receiving a request to switch from the current network context to a new network context further comprises receiving a new guid with a request to switch to a new network context associated with the new guid (col. 8 lines 1-17); and

the switching from the current network context further comprises switching from the current network context to a new network context that is associated with the new guid (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 5, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 4, wherein the switching further comprises:

setting one or more global pointers to reference one or more directories uniquely associated with the new guid (col. 8 lines 1-17).

Art Unit: 2127

As per claim 6, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 5, wherein the new network context includes shared web page data, and wherein the web page data is stored in a location based on a hash of a universal resource locator [URL] for the web page (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58).

As per claim 7, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 5, wherein the new network context includes web page data specific to a user, and wherein the web page data is stored in a location based on a combination of the new guid and universal a resource locator [URL] for the web page (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58).

As per claim 8, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 4, wherein the switching to a new network context further comprises:

storing the current network context in a directory uniquely associated with the current guid (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 9, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the current network context is a current Internet context and the new network context is a new Internet context (col. 1 lines 29-41).

As per claim 10, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recite in claim 1, further comprising:

determining if the new network context is valid (col. 8 lines 1-17); and

switching network contexts only if the new network context is valid (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 11, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein switching network contexts further comprises switching universal resource locator [URL] cache components from current URL cache components to new URL cache components (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 6 line 51 - col. 7 line 5).

As per claim 13, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein a network context comprises a set of objects, one object for each network state (col. 10 lines 1-22).

As per claim 14, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein a network context is an Internet context that comprises a set of objects, one object for each Internet state (col. 10 lines 1-22).

As per claim 15, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 14, wherein the set of objects is comprised of one or more of the following types of objects: cookies, history, Internet content, or user-defined data (col. 1 line 50 - col. 2 line 4).

As per claim 16, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein:

Art Unit: 2127

the network context comprises cache components (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 6 line 51 - col. 7 line 5);

the switching further comprises:

shutting down cache components of the current network context to prevent operations utilizing the cache components (col. 9 lines 36-58);

flushing data uniquely associated with the current network context (col. 9 lines 36-58);

creating a set of cache components for the new network context (col. 9 lines 36-58); and

resetting a session start time to begin a new session (col. 7 lines 6-23).

As per claim 17, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein:

a current network connection is an Internet connection (col. 1 lines 29-41);

a new network connection is an Internet connection (col. 1 lines 29-41);

the current network context is an Internet context that includes current web page content (col. 3 lines 34-60);

the new network context is an Internet context that includes new web page content (col. 3 lines 34-60);

the method further comprises:

storing the current web page content (col. 6 lines 31-50);



setting one or more global pointers to reference the new web page content (col. 8 lines 1-17); and  
the switching further comprises:  
utilizing the referenced new page content for further processing (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 18, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 17, wherein setting one or more global pointers to reference the new web page content further comprises:

hashing a universal resource locator [URL] of a web page from which the web page content is derived (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58); and  
setting one or more global pointers to the new web page content in a memory location associated with the hash value derived from hashing the URL (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58).

As per claim 19, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 18, wherein the setting one or more global pointers further comprises:

identifying the new web page content as being user-specific (col. 1 lines 29-41);  
determining a globally unique identifier [guid] associated with the new Internet context (col. 7 lines 6-23);  
determining a value associated with the guid (col. 7 lines 6-23);  
hashing a combination of the URL and the value associated with the guid (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 8 lines 1-17);

Art Unit: 2127

setting the one or more global pointers to the new web page content in a memory location associated with the hash value derived from hashing the combination of the URL and the value associated with the guid (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 21, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, perform the following steps:

receiving a request to switch from a first Internet context associated with a first user identity to a second Internet context associated with a second user identity (col. 8 lines 1-17);

halting operations utilizing the first Internet context (col. 8 lines 1-17);

initializing operations utilizing the second Internet context without requiring a process shutdown (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 22, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 21, wherein the halting operations utilizing the first Internet context includes storing first Internet context data in one or more containers associated with the first user identity (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 23, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 21, wherein the initializing operations utilizing the second user identity includes setting one or more global pointers to Internet context data associated with

Art Unit: 2127

the second user identity that is stored in one or more containers associated with the second user identity (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 25, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including an Internet management object stored on a computer-readable medium, comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following steps:

receiving a request to switch from a first Internet context associated with a first user identity to a second Internet context associated with a second user identity (col. 8 lines 1-17);

storing the first Internet context in one or more containers associated with the first user identity (col. 8 lines 1-17);

setting one or more global pointers to reference the second Internet context located in one or more containers associated with the second user identity without requiring open processes associated with the first user identity to shut down (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 27, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the Internet management object as recited in claim 25, wherein the first Internet context further includes first Internet content stored in a memory location and identified in an index record, the index record being identified according to a hash value of a URL associated with the first Internet content (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58).

As per claim 28, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the Internet management object as recited in claim 27, wherein the first Internet content is shared content (col. 9 lines 36-58).

As per claim 29, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the Internet content management object as recited in claim 25, wherein the first Internet context includes first Internet content stored in a memory location and identified in an index record, the index record being identified according to a hash value of a URL associated with the first Internet content and a value uniquely associated with the first user identity (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58).

As per claim 30, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the Internet management object as recited in claim 29, wherein the first Internet content is user-specific content (col. 9 lines 36-58).

As per claim 31, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including a computer system comprising:

a registry that includes one or more global pointer that reference one or more containers that store a first Internet context and a second Internet context (col. 8 line 1-17);

an Internet management component that associates a first identifier with the first Internet context and a second identifier with the second Internet context (col. 8 line 1-17);

wherein the Internet management component is configured to halt processing of the first Internet context and initialize processing by the second Internet context without shutting down

Art Unit: 2127

other processes when it receives a request to switch from a first user identity identified by the first identifier to a second user identity identified by the second identifier (col. 8 line 1-17).

As per claim 32, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the computer system as recited in claim 31, wherein:

the first Internet context includes first Internet content from a first web page having a first universal resource locator [URL] (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58);

one of the global pointers references a first memory location derived by hashing the first URL (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58); and

the Internet management component is further configured to store the first Internet context data in a container referenced by the global pointer that references the first memory location (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 33, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the computer system as recited in claim 31, wherein:

the first Internet context includes first Internet content from a first web page having a first universal resource locator [URL] (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58);

a first user identity is associated with a unique value (col. 7 lines 6-23);

one of the global pointers references a first identity memory location derived by hashing the first URL and the unique value (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58); and

the Internet management component is further configured to store the first Internet context data in a container referenced by the global pointer that references the first identity memory location (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 34, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the computer system as recited in claim 31, wherein:

the second Internet context includes second Internet content from a second web page having a second universal resource locator [URL] (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58);

one of the global pointers references a second memory location derived by hashing the second URL (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58); and

the Internet management component is further configured to set the global pointer to reference the second memory location (col. 8 lines 1-17).

As per claim 35, Courts teaches the invention as claimed, including the computer system as recited in claim 31, wherein:

the second Internet context includes second Internet content from a second web page having a second universal resource locator [URL] (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58);

the second user identity is associated with a second unique value (col. 7 lines 6-23);

one of the global pointers references a second identity memory location derived by hashing a combination of the second URL and the second unique value (col. 6 lines 5-30; col. 9 lines 36-58); and

the Internet management component is further configured to set the global pointer to reference the second identity memory location (col. 8 lines 1-17).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. Claims 20, 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courts.

As per claims 20, “Official Notice” is taken that although Courts does not specifically teach the value associated with the guid is an ordinal, such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Specifically, Courts does not specify the manner in which session identifiers are represented in memory, although Courts does state that state data, for example, can be represented as a character string, or any other type of object to which meaning can be attached. It would have been obvious to represent session identifiers in the same manner, such that each session is easily distinguishable as a distinct ordinal number.

As per claims 36-43, “Official Notice” is taken that although Courts does not specifically teach that the first user identity and the second user identity may pertain to either the same user or different users, such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Specifically, Courts teaches of assigning unique session identifiers for each client session, although the same user may log out and log in to different sessions, or a new user could log in to a new session. There is nothing within Courts to limit the session manager to handling the same user or different users. Rather, both instances would be supported. In addition, user profiles are maintained for

Art Unit: 2127

each user for specific content, adding additional features to the way in which the session state data is maintained and accessed.

8. Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courts in view of Anderson et al. (previously cited) (hereinafter Anderson).

As per claim 12, Anderson teaches the invention as claimed, including the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the new network context is a default network context (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Courts and Anderson since the establishing of a default Internet state would allow the network session to continue regardless of what previous parameters existed. Thereafter, the session data that was stored previous to the session termination could be loaded. This would allow network communication to continue as desired. If, on the other hand, the switch in contexts was in response to a switch in users, it may be desirable to load a clean network context, wherein loading a default context would allow browsing that is unaffected by session data of a previous user.

As per claim 24, Anderson teaches the invention as claimed, including the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 21, wherein the initializing operations utilizing the second user identity includes setting one or more global pointers to reference default Internet context data and associating the Internet context data with the second user identity (Abstract).



***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claim 26 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Claim 44 is allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 and 27-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,


Art Unit: 2127


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed J Ali whose telephone number is (703) 305-8106. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5:30, 2nd Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai T An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Syed Ali  
April 2, 2004

  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100